



THE COMPTHOLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

THE SAME

X

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FILE:

DATE: 001 8 1976

B+186065

MATTER OF:

Arthur K. Henning - Reimbursement for parking fees - Change of duty location within official station

DIGEST:

Claim of U.S. Customs Service employee for parking fees while assigned for 6 months to Seattle Federal Office Building from usual place of duty on Seattle waterfront may not be authorized for payment. Agency has discretion to determine whether relocation of workplace within official station is of short duration, and travel thereto official business, or whether such relocation is change of regular workplace, and travel thereto nonreimbursable commuting expenses. Amency policy places employee's relocation within latter class. GAO will not question agency policy if reasons le, as here.

This action is in response to a request dated February 27, 1976, by the Director, Financial Management Division, United States Customs Service, San Francisco, for our decision concerning a claim by Mr. Arthur K. Hennir; for parking fees while assigned to a new place of duty. Comments on this matter have been received from both the Matienal Treesury Employees Union and the claimant. No voucher was presented with the submission.

The authority of this Office to issue advance decisions to certifying officers is limited to questions involved in specific vowthers presented to them for certification. 31 U.S.C. 82d (1970); see 26 Comp. Gen. 797 (1947); 51 id. 701 (1972). We therefore, will treat this submission as a request for decision from the head of the Department under 31 U.S.C. 74 (1970).

The record shows that Mr. Henning, a customs inspector at grade CS-9, has claimed parking fees for the period from April 15, 1974 to October 24, 1974, when he was informally assigned to act as a quantity control officer at the Federal Office Building, Seattle, Washington. The duties to which he was assigned were those of a miscellaneous documents examiner grade GS-7. Prior to this assignment, Mr. Henning was assigned to Station 5, Terminal 106E, at the southern end of the Seattle waterfront, approximately 2.5 miles from the Federal Building. Mr. Henning's claim initially was made in the form of a grievance.

11-1-16-65

The Customs Service denied in. Jenning's claim on the basis that in. Henring's ansignment at the Federal Office Buildwing constituted an assignment to a replace of duty and that in. Henring was therefore in a commuter status and not estitled to reinforcement for the expenses of satting to and from the Proming contends, however, that since there was no position at the Federal Office Building for a Customs Inspector and US-3, and that since the two official positions for macellansous document examiners grade US-7 at the Federal Office Duilains were filled, he therefore must have been on temporary duty and Deflection to parking fees for the paried of this assignment.

For purposes of clarity, it is necessary to first differentiate between "official station," or the sectraptic limits of the area at which an employee is as it rad, and the specific place of performance of daty within such official station. For lack of a between term, we shall refer to an employee's specific place of performance of duty as a "workplace."

The Federal Traval Regulations (FTR), if M 181-7 (1973), define official station as bounded by the componete limits of the city or town in which the officer or employee is stationed. FTR para, 1-1.3(c)(1). Temporary duty has been interpreted to denote work performed in a travel status and, therefore, not essarily involves the travel of an employee away from his efficial station. Tee 21 Corp. Jan. 591 (1991). We note here that both fersions 10% and the Federal Office Building are within the city limits of Scattle, which was in Menning's official station. In these circumstances, in Menning's reassignment constitutes a change in useigned workplace within his official station rather than temporary juty.

The FTC authorizes the reinbursement to amployees of the expense of the use of privately owned conveyances on official outsides within an outside their official station, including the expense of parking foes. Iffi para, 1-4.1. An employee's travel to a different workplace within his official duty station, a.s., other than his usual workplace, tay be considered travel for official business within the exercise of administrative discretion. See 35 Comp. Gen. 705 (1957). The proper exercise of this discretion, however, requires that consideration on given

to the general rule that employees rust bear the expenses of commuting to their jobs. This Office has consistently held that no authority exists for reinbursecant of an employee for the expenses incurred in traveling from his residence to his place of business. See 11 Comp. Jen. 417 (1932); 15 11. 342 (1935); 19 1d. 836; 8-182427, October 9, 1975. The question, therefore, is whether the employee's assignment to another work-place is of such short duration that travel thereto may be considered official outliness away from the employee's usual workplace, or whether the new workplace bucows the employee's regular place of business, so as to prohibit reimbursement for traveling expenses.

Is considering questions involving an employee's post of duty, this Office has consistently held that an employee's official station is the place at which he performs the major part of his duties and is expected to spend the present part of his time. 3? Comp. Gen. 87 (1952); B-197427, Supra. The same standard is applicable in determining the location of an employee's regular porkplace. Furthernore, since the question of the location of an employee's workplace is essentially a factual matter, such determinations are primarily matters for the administrative energy. We will not question the atency's determination as long as it is reasonable. B-175057, July 27, 1972.

In this recard, the Customs Service has advised us that it is the policy of the Regional office to allow miles and parking fees when essignments are made to other places of duty within the employee's regular scheduled tour of duty (40 hour week). When it is determined that the new place of assignment will continue beyond the following scheduled tour of duty, the employee is directed to report to the newly assigned place of duty and is considered to be in a commuting status and must report there at his own expense. We see nothing unreasonable in either the Region's policy or in its application to the claim of Er. Denning.

In view of the foregoing, 'r. Henning's claim may not be authorized for payment.

In addition, the Director, Financial Panagement Division, San Francisco, has specifically requested our determination regardin; the time when an employee can be considered to be

B-136665

ansigned to allocation workplace within his official duty station so as to be in a commuter status. However, we are of the opinion that establishment by this Office of a mirid time limit applicable in all ce as is neither required nor appropriate. As stated above, we regard the matter as involving an element of administrative discretion and judgment in the determination of the location or change in location of an employee's workplace. An administrative determination or policy will not be quentioned by us to long as it is reasonable in the circumstances. We are satisfied here that the policy of the Customs Service Region regarding such changes meets this standard.

The Director has also asked whether assignments of this type must be in writing. We do not have the regulations of the administrative office before us and do not know if such a requirement is stated therein, nor do we know of a general requirement for prior written authorization for such assignments. Fowever, we have previously indicated that we would accept approval of the exproper's reimbursement voucher by an appropriate official as sufficient evidence of authority for local travel so long as this mathod of approval was in conforcity with a sency regulations. 3-173279, August 16, 1971.

R. F. KETLEY

Deputy Comptroller General of the United States